UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,488	12/11/2006	Yuval Hager	P-6283-US	8200

49443 7590 05/12/2008

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway
12th Floor
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER
HENRY, MARIEGEORGES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/577,488	HAGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARIE GEORGES HENRY	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 December 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the application filed on 01/16/ 2007. Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1-27 are directed to device, system, and method for storage and access of computer files.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-13, 14-18, 20-21, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bodnar (hereinafter "Bodnar") (US 6,012,063).

Bodnar discloses the invention including device, system, and method for storage and access of computer files (see abstract).

Regarding claim 1, Bodnar discloses a method comprising: receiving from a remote site a request to access a first file having a plurality of blocks (Bodnar, column 6, lines 35-36, column 6, lines 1-3, the device receives a request to modify a file made of many blocks), said request having a pre-defined format encapsulating an original request of a client of a synchronous client-server system and in accordance with a pre-defined file system (Bodnar, column 4 , lines 63-67, the transfer of a delta file is made to a file system according to Delta Block File System specific design);

determining, for each of at least some of said plurality of blocks, a differential portion representing a difference between each said block and a corresponding block of a second file (Bodnar, column 6 , lines 7-10, a simple checksum or a similar comparison is used to find the change of a block);

and sending said differential portion to said remote site (Bodnar, column 6, lines 54-61, by using the method of detecting modifications only a change of the file is transferred from a host device to a portable device).

Regarding claim 2, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 1, comprising reconstructing said first file at said remote site based on said differential portion and said second file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 34-50, a file is updated in a device by transferring the block changed in another device).

Regarding claim 3, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 1, comprising identifying one or more blocks of said first file with a unique ID corresponding to a content of said one or more blocks (Bodnar, column 5, line 4-19, each block has a basic structure with a header that identifies the block).

Regarding claim 4, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 1, comprising identifying one or more blocks of said first file with a hash value of the contents of said one or more blocks (Bodnar, column 6, lines 19-20, a checksum value located in the header of a file distinguished this file from its previous version).

Regarding claim 6, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 1; comprising determining whether said second file correlates to said first file based on a heuristic (Bodnar, column

6, lines 9-10, a block checksum is compared against its prior checksum).

Regarding claim 7, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 6, comprising monitoring a modification performed on said first file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 43-46, the last updated block is kept track on and stored in a device).

Regarding claim 11, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 1, comprising storing said differential portion in a directory for later retrieval of a version of said first file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 18-20, the checksum or CRC value of a block is stored to be compare with newer version).

Regarding claim 12, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 1, comprising setting a read-only access permission to a files is said remote site if said remote site is non communicating (Bodnar, column 3, lines 48-50, a ROM (Read –only memory) feature is disclosed)

Regarding claim 13, Bodnar discloses the method of claim 1, comprising storing in a cache at least one block of said second file (Bodnar, column 6 , lines 18-19, an element of block header is stored).

Regarding claim 14, Bodnar discloses a method comprising: receiving from a remote site a request to access a first file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 35-36, column 6, lines 1-3,

the device receives a request to modify a file made of many blocks), said request having a pre-defined format encapsulating an original request of a client of a synchronous client-server system and in accordance with a pre-defined file system (Bodnar, column 4 , lines 63-67, the transfer of a delta file is made to a file system according to Delta Block File System specific design);

determining, based on a heuristic, that said first file correlated to a second file having similar data (Bodnar, column 6, lines 9-10, a block checksum is compared against its prior checksum);

determining a differential portion representing a difference between said first file and said second file (Bodnar, column 6 , lines 7-10, a simple checksum or a similar comparison is used to find the change of a block);

and sending said differential portion to said remote site (Bodnar, column 6, lines 54-61, by using the method of detecting modifications only the change of the file is transferred from a host device to a portable device).

Regarding claim 15, Bodnar discloses a system comprising: a first computing platform having access to a first file and a second file, the first file having a plurality of blocks ((Bodnar, column 6, lines 35-36, column 6, lines 1-3, the device receives a request to modify a file made of many blocks);

and a second computing platform having access to said first file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 60-61, a portable device has accessed to a host device),

wherein said first computing platform is able to receive from said second computing platform a request to access said second file, said request having a pre-defined format encapsulating an original request of a client of a synchronous client-server system and in accordance with a pre-defined file system (Bodnar, column 4 , lines 63-67, the transfer of a delta file is made to a file system according to Delta Block File System specific design),

wherein said first computing platform is able to determine, for each of at least some of said plurality of blocks, a differential portion representing a difference between each said block and a corresponding block of said second file (Bodnar, column 6 , lines 7-10, a simple checksum or a similar comparison is used to find the change of a block),

and wherein said first computing platform is able to send said differential portion to said second computing platform (Bodnar, column 6, lines 54-61, by using the method of detecting modifications only the change of the file is transferred from a host device to a portable device).

Regarding claim 16, Bodnar discloses the system of claim 14, wherein said second computing platform is able to reconstruct said second file based on said differential portion and said first file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 34-50, a file is updated in a device by transferring the block changed in another device).

Regarding claim 17, Bodnar discloses the system of claim 14, wherein said first computing platform is able to identify one or more blocks of said second file with a unique ID which corresponds to a content of said one or more blocks (Bodnar, column 5, line 4-19, each block has a basic structure with a header that identifies the block).

Regarding claim 18, Bodnar discloses the system of claim 14, wherein said first computing platform is able to identify one or more blocks of said second file with a hash value of the contents of said one or more blocks (Bodnar, column 6, lines 19-20, a checksum value located in the header of a file distinguished this file from its previous version).

Regarding claim 20, Bodnar discloses the system of claim 14, wherein said first computing platform is able to determine whether said first file correlates to said second file based on a heuristic (Bodnar, column 6, lines 9-10, a block checksum is compared against its prior checksum).

Regarding claim 21, Bodnar discloses the system of claim 19, wherein said first

computing platform is able to monitor a modification performed on said first file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 43-46, the last updated block is kept and stored in a device).

Regarding claim 25, Bodnar discloses the system of claim 14, wherein said first computing platform is able to store said differential portion in a directory associated with an archived version of said second file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 18-20, the checksum or CRC value of a block is stored for convenience).

Regarding claim 26, Bodnar discloses the system of claim 14, comprising a cache to store at least one block of said first file (Bodnar, column 6, lines 18-19, an element of block header is stored).

Regarding claim 27, Bodnar discloses a computing platform able to determine, based on a heuristic, that a first file correlates to a second file having similar contents (Bodnar, column 6, lines 9-10, a block checksum is compared against its prior checksum), to calculate a differential portion representing a difference between said first file and said second file ((Bodnar, column 6 , lines 7-10, a simple checksum or a similar comparison is used to find the change of a block).

and to send said differential portion to another computing platform (Bodnar, column 6,

lines 54-61, by using the method of detecting modifications only a change of the file is transferred from a host device to a portable device).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 8-10, 19, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar in view of Palevich et al. (hereinafter "Palevich") (US 6,889,256).

Regarding claim 5, Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose a method comprising receiving from said remote site a lock request when said remote site requests to modify said first file.

Palevich discloses a method comprising receiving from said remote site a lock request when said remote site requests to modify said first file (Palevich, column 5, lines 24-26, a server determines if a user has locked a file before letting another user writes in it).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Palevich's locking feature into Bodnar system in order to enable the system to lock the file when it is in use to have better control of a file access.

Regarding claim 8, Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose a method wherein said receiving comprises receiving from said remote site a request to access said first file using a global name space of said client-server system.

Palevich discloses a method wherein said receiving comprises receiving from said remote site a request to access said first file using a global name space of said client-server system (Palevich, column 3, lines 1-2, a transmission medium is the internet

which uses global name space).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Palevich's URL scheme into Bodnar system in order to create a system with a URL scheme in order to identify and retrieve a file easier.

Regarding claim 9, Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose a method comprising receiving from said remote site a request for authentication using a pass-through challenge-response me.

Palevich discloses a method comprising receiving from said remote site a request for authentication using a pass-through challenge-response me (Palevich, column 4, lines 59-67, a client accesses a file through a system of request and response).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to implement Palevich's authenticating feature into Bodnar system in order to create a system with an authenticating feature in order to make the file access system more reliable.

Regarding claim 10, Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose a method comprising processing a set of credentials for authentication.

Palevich discloses a method comprising processing a set of credentials for authentication (Palevich, column 4, lines 42-51, a request system based on validating of a block map is disclosed).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Palevich's authenticating feature into Bodnar system in order to create a system with an authenticating feature in order to make the file access system more reliable.

Regarding claim 19, Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose the system wherein said first computing platform is able to receive from said second computing platform a lock request when said second computing platform requests to modify said second file.

Palevich discloses the system wherein said first computing platform is able to receive from said second computing platform a lock request when said second computing

platform requests to modify said second file (Palevich, column 5, lines 24-26, a server determines if a user has locked a file before letting another user writes in it).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Palevich's locking feature into Bodnar system in order to enable the system to lock the file when it is in use to have better control of a file access.

Regarding claim 22, Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose the system wherein said first file and said second file share a global name space.

Palevich discloses the system wherein said first file and said second file share a global name space (Palevich, column 3, lines 1-2, a transmission medium is the internet which uses global name space).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Palevich's URL scheme into Bodnar system in order to create a system with a URL scheme in order to identify and retrieve a file easier.

Regarding claim 23 Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose the system wherein said first computing platform is able to receive from said second computing platform a request for authentication using a pass-through challenge-response.

Palevich discloses the system wherein said first computing platform is able to receive from said second computing platform a request for authentication using a pass-through challenge-response (Palevich, column 4, lines 59-67, a client accesses a file through a system of request and response).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to implement Palevich's authenticating feature into Bodnar system in order to create a system with an authenticating feature in order to make the file access system more reliable.

Regarding claim 24, Bodnar discloses the claimed invention as described above.

However, Bodnar does not disclose the system wherein said first computing platform is able to receive from said second computing platform a set of credentials for authentication.

Palevich discloses the system wherein said first computing platform is able to receive from said second computing platform a set of credentials for authentication (Palevich, column 4, lines 42-51, a request system based on validating of a block map is disclosed).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Palevich's authenticating feature into Bodnar system in order to create a system with an authenticating feature in order to make the file access system more reliable.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kaplan et al. (US 6,594, 674 B1) is made part of the record because of the teaching of generating blocks of files. Draper et al. (US 6,604,236 B1) are made part of the record because the teaching of updating files. Heath et al. (6,636,872 B1) is made part of the record because of the teaching of file synchronization. Domenikos et al. (5,838,916) is made part of the record because of the teaching of remote access. Martin (5,867,706) is made part of the record because of the teaching of load balance. Sim (US 6,970,939 B2) is made part of the record because of the teaching of storing blocks of files. Richard (US 6,728,711 B2) is made part of the record because of the teaching of differential technique. Kasriel et al. (US 7,188, 214 B1) is made part of the record because of the teaching of differential caching technique.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be **directed to Marie Georges Henry whose telephone number is (571) 270-3226.** The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30am - 4:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marie Georges Henry/

Examiner, Art Unit 2155

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2155